



RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP 2182
PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q57164

Do-hyoung KIM

Appln. No.: 09/445,769

Group Art Unit: 2182

Confirmation No.: 1355

Examiner: TAMMARA R. PEYTON

Filed: December 13, 1999

For: METHOD FOR DISPLAYING OPERATION STATE OF SYSTEM DEVICES IN
NETWORK SYSTEM

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated October 4, 2005, please amend the above-identified application as follows on the accompanying pages.

been a client in the system described in Mano. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain how the GUI allegedly is, or is part of, a client device.

Further, even if it could be understood by one skilled in the art that the “nodes” referred to in Lawande could refer to a client device, there is still no teaching or suggestion that the control display window or GUI described in Mano is a client device or a component thereof.

Yet further, in the second paragraph of the *Response to Arguments* section, the Examiner appears to focus on the purpose of the signal allegedly sent to the display device. However, even if, *assuming arguendo*, said signal does indicate an operational state of a server device (as the Examiner alleges), said signal is not received by a client device, as discussed above and as reflected in claim 1.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant maintains that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references, either alone or in combination.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-4, 8, and 9 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

Further, with respect to dependent claim 2, Applicant maintains that the applied references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least that, “the client device establishes said communication channel with respect to the server devices by periodic polling in the step (a),” as recited in claim 2.

Applicant submits that independent claims 5, 6, and 7 are patentable at least for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. With respect to dependent claims 10 and 11, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 6.